

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
June 16, 2016**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Co-Chairman Joseph Palmquist, Craig Krueger, Henry Liu, Kevin Sutton and Zoi Karagouni.

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Renard Mun and David Scott Meade

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee, Sarah Pyle, Benjamin Sticka, David Lee and Steve Fischer, Redmond Planning

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Co-Chairman Palmquist at 7:04 p.m.

MINUTES

MOVED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 21, 2016 MEETING, SECONDED BY MR. LIU. MOTION CARRIED (3-0) WITH 2 ABSTENTIONS.

MOVED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 5, 2016 MEETING, SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION CARRIED (4-0) WITH 1 ABSTENTION.

APPROVAL

LAND-2015-01469, Marymoor Park Apartments

Description: Applicant is requesting changes to balcony design and materials

Location: Approximately 6499 East Lake Sammamish Parkway NE

Architect: Raymond Gamo *with* Jackson Main Architecture

Contact: Mark Hoyt *with* Trammel Crow Residential

Prior Review Date: 09/03/15 & 11/05/15

Staff Contact: Sarah Pyle, 425-556-2426 or svanags@redmond.gov

This project first received approval from the board on January 21, 2016 and is back tonight for some post approval changes. The first change is in the siding product and samples of the replacement product were presented. The second change is replacing metal roof with shingles and the third change is the removal of balconies, which is allowed under the code. This will create some exterior design changes, which will need approval. Staff has some concerns about the quality of materials.

Mr. Robin Murphy with Jackson Main Architecture said this is a wrapped, 5 story building which wraps around a 5 story concrete garage. The roofs are primarily TPO with parapets with shed roofs and the proposal is to change them to 25 year warranted shingle roofs. The roofs will not be visible because this building is the tallest building in the area.

The siding change is switching from Therma-Ray as it is very difficult to source and using Woodtone instead. The two dark brown colors are what has been chosen. This material has a 50 year warranty. The final change is the balconies that will be removed in the interior court. To mitigate that change, there will be Juliet balconies on the 5th floor interior court. New drawing packets were handed out to the Board.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Has no concerns with the roofing material changes.
- Asked how the new siding will be applied. Mr. Murphy said it would be installed the same way lapped siding is applied.
- Why was the 5th floor chosen for the Juliet balconies? Mr. Murphy responded that they would provide texture to the building.

Mr. Liu:

- Is happy with the proposed changes.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if the roof will have an upturn of metal flashing to finish it off and Mr. Murphy stated that was how the roofs would be finished.

Ms. Karagouni:

- Asked if there was a strategy to collect water from the roof or some sort of solar panels. Mr. Murphy said solar panels were under consideration at one time; however, the water is completely infiltrated back into the site.
- Asked if the parapets would be lit and Mr. Murphy said they will be lit by the interior lights from the units.

The consensus of the Board was that the proposed changes are ready to approve.

MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO LAND-2015-01469, MARYMOOR PARK APARTMENTS PER THE DRAWINGS HANDED OUT AND MATERIALS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION CARRIES (5-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2016-00733, Woodrun Phase II

Description: Construction of nine townhouse units (three buildings), parking, access and utilities

Location: TBD (parcel number: 7200002050)

Contact: Patricia McPherson *with* Woodrun Townhomes, LLC

Staff Contact: Sarah Pyle, 425-556-2426 or svanags@redmond.gov

This is the first pre-application for this project located on Education Hill in an R-18 and partially an R-1 zone. Access will be shared with Woodrun I, off of 180th Avenue and 95th Street. Staff is

pleased with the overall design and color palate although it is dark. This site is completely surrounded by mature growth trees.

Mr. Joshua May gave a summary of the project and stated that it is a 40,000 sq. ft. site. Development is restricted to the eastern portion of the site due to a steep slope on the west. Each townhouse will be approximately 2,220 sq. ft. with a double car garage on the ground floor. There are 9 compact spaces provided. The mature trees will be retained and new landscaping will be done with native plants except for around the townhouses, which will be done with other plants to give softening to the edges of the homes. Bays are used in the design to recess and modulate the elevations to create more shadow and interest. The roof design is used to create more of a residential feel to the homes. The materials that are proposed are weathered steels, wood, cement panels and others that are scaled to the neighborhood. The entrances to the homes will be lighter in color and the windows will be a nice bronze color. The units are staggered to permit views both off site and on site.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Sutton:

- Said in the rendering, everything looks like the same color.
- Stated that the siding makes sense.
- Likes that the building are staggered.

Mr. Liu:

- Suggested that maybe the group of the three building could be turned clockwise 90° to create more privacy.
- Is looking for more detail at the next meeting as far as materials and roofs.

Mr. Matthew Stannard asked Mr. Liu for more details about the orientation he suggested. Mr. Liu said if the upper left hand group could be turned clockwise 90° and the two units turned to face south instead of facing east, that would create more privacy and the other buildings would not be facing each other so closely.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated this is a great start on the massing.
- Likes the orientation of the first building because it tucks into the hill nicely.

Mr. Kruger asked staff why there is more parking when there are already two spaces per unit. Ms. Pyle said that because there is no street parking allowed here due to access for emergency vehicles and delivery vans.

Ms. Karagouni:

- Agrees with Mr. Liu as to the orientation of the buildings to reach more of the Earth and sky mission of the developer.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Feels the project is off to a good start.
- Said perhaps the beams that support the roofs could be made to blend in more with the project.
- Would like to see a little more contrast in colors.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2016-00100, Alexan Central Park Apartments

Description: 8-story building with 1 level of retail and live/work tenants, 7 levels of residential apartments, mix of studio, one-and two-bedroom units. 4-level parking garage for 200 cars. Total building square footage will be 243,357 sf.

Location: 16160 NE 80th Street

Contact: Matthew Laase *with* Jackson Main Architecture

Prior Review Date: 02/04/16 & 04/21/16

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated that this is the third pre-application for this project and staff is pleased with the direction this design is going. This should be ready for approval next time.

Mr. Robin Murphy, with Jackson Main Architecture, said this is an unusual building for Redmond. It is an 8 story building and a 5 over 3 which means it has 5 levels of type 3A construction and 3 levels of type 1A. It is very efficient and the parking garage has been concealed within the building's podium. The parking garage is not very visible from the street and is flanked by units. This project is in Town Square and is in the same neighborhood as Veloce apartment and to the east is the Ravelo project that will start construction soon.

There will be under 200 units and enough parking to serve those residents. This originally was a U shaped building that has been cut and twisted a bit to face the new park that will be built soon. The courtyard is on the 4th floor which is on top of the podium. As the building wraps around the corner there is a vocabulary of contrasts from light to dark. The Woodtone materials will be used in this building as in others presented at this meeting.

On the west façade, brick will be used in conjunction with the dark Woodtone, contrasted with the cement board panels and aluminum extrusions at the joints. At the corner of the building will be 4 live/work units. In the alley there will be lattice work on the building with green plant materials growing up at the entrance to the garage.

In order to be 8 stories in height, the site has to have 20% public open space and part of that is in the curb bulb. There will be a lot of work done in this area with bike pathways, etc. The courtyard will be open to the residents only. Also, at level 8 there is a bridge between the buildings that opens up to amenities like barbecues, indoor kitchen, indoor/outdoor lounge plus much more.

Mr. Mark Brumbaugh gave a brief recap since most of the Board has seen this project before and will highlight just the changes. The bike path is marked in gray brick in the drawing and there will be imbedded LED lighting in the paving. On 161st the landscape has been pushed out from the building to create more a streetscape and provide more walking space. The courtyard on level 4 will have a variety of planters with plants trailing over the edge of the wall.

Mr. Matt Laase said it was decided not to clad the round columns in brick, but to skin coat and paint them so they would blend into the building. There is a deviation that was proposed on the live/work units and would like some direction from the Board to see if that is acceptable. The east elevation, which was not shown at the last meeting, is shown here with the Boston ivy that will climb the wall finishing off the project nicely. There was discussion at the last meeting about having glass balconies across the front of the building, but it was decided that this would create distractions from all the glass in the building.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Likes the way the design has progressed and all the drama that has been added.
- The live/work units are all one floor with no lofts and he is fine with the deviation.

Mr. Lee asked about the landscape deviation and the missing trees; is there a reason for those spots? Mr. Lasse said there are storm pipes and utilities in that area that are causing the conflict. Mr. Lee said if the conflict is with a utility meter box, the City would like to have those moved into hardscaped areas. Mr. Lasse and Mr. Brumbaugh stated that the conflict is with underground utilities and there are no trees there now. Mr. Lee asked that they take another look and see if there is some way to get the trees in those spaces.

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the boxes on the renderings and what they represent. Mr. Lasse stated those are the patio spaces for the residents.

Mr. Liu:

- Is happy with the project throughout its progression.
- Is looking forward to seeing it when it is finished

Mr. Sutton:

- Agrees with Mr. Liu and appreciates the green walls.
- Said there is a lot of white so hopefully, there is a good maintenance program to deal with the rain and moss.

Ms. Karagouni:

- Likes the landscaping.
- Consider the signage on a lower level to be more engaging. Mr. Murphy said that will be under consideration and will most likely do a monument sign somewhere.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked if the ground cover where the trees are missing will be the same as on the rest of the project. Mr. Brumbaugh stated that they will be same at this point. Mr. Palmquist suggested using tall grasses or something different to celebrate the space when street trees cannot be planted.

- Is in support of the deviation on the live/work units.
- Asked about the separation between the building to the east and this new building. Mr. Lasse said there is about 15 feet, however, that floor is parking, so there will be units looking in on the parking.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2016-00279, Esterra Park Apartments, Blocks 5, 6A, 9

Description: 3 buildings with approximately 661 residential units

Location: TBD (parcel number: 0673100050)

Contact: Scott Clark *with* Clark Design Group, LLC

Prior Review Date: 05/05/16

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2462, dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee stated this is the second meeting for this project and turned the meeting over to Mr. Clark.

Mr. Scott Clark showed the intersection of Turing and 156th with the Microsoft building in view. The building on 156th is set back about 11 feet due to the PSE easement. On the south side of the building will be a pedestrian pathway, which will connect across Turing to a large courtyard, which ultimately connects with the park. The setbacks were shown on the design. As part of this project Tagore, Graham and 26th streets will be built. The materials board was presented at this meeting. There will be formed exposed concrete that will have a decorative finish. The materials are meant to engage people with the building with nice touch points. Slides were shown to indicate entrances on various buildings and the different amenity spaces provided. Each building has a lobby space. There is also a monumental stair in this project. A nice bridge with great views connects the two different amenity spaces which have a lot of seating areas indoor and outside.

Mr. Brumbaugh gave an overview of the plant materials to be used and the landscape design. For buildings A, B and B South, the largest change is the courtyards. Before, there were 2 pedestrian spines and a formal layout of plantings. Now it has a much more organic feel and flow in that area. There are recreational spaces such as a croquet court, ping pong tables and other activity areas. The plaza space, which Mr. Clark showed earlier, will be fully open to the public and accessible from the sidewalk on Turing.

Building 6A did not have a much of a change from the last time the project was here primarily due the size of building.

Mr. Clark showed slides of the views from the buildings and the separation between buildings. Each unit in all the building will have a lot of sunlight.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Liu:

- Is pleased with the improvements and happy to see the development on a human scale.
- Stated that the stairs and the open shared activities area on the plans are great to see.

Mr. Sutton:

- Feels there are enough textures and activities going on.
- Stated that the more he looks at the project, the more he likes it.
- Would like to see more detail on the roof next time.

Mr. Krueger:

- Feels that the corner on 156th, building 6A needs to be more dramatic and important.
- Thinks the west façade of building B and the interface with the concrete wall could use more color and landscape. Mr. Brumbaugh said there will be a nice architectural wall with plants that will provide more color and interest.

Ms. Karagouni:

- Is pleased with the landscape plan for this large project.
- Feels residents who live in building 6A may feel left out because it does not have as many layers and it is missing the volume and variety of the other buildings.
- Asked if there is a strategy for all the buildings to have roof gardens. Mr. Clark replied that because of the height limit roof gardens are not allowed, which is why the amenity spaces are placed where they are. There are a lot of courtyards and outdoor spaces.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Thinks the parapets on the rendering step up and down a little bit and others look flat, what is the thought behind that. The answer to that question is that it depends on which building is being looked at; each building has a different look and feel to them.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Clark if he feels this project could be ready for approval next time. Mr. Clark is confident that it will be ready for approval next time.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2016-01087, North Redmond Elementary

Description: Proposal includes 30 classrooms and 4 portables and will accommodate 624 students and 44 staff

Location: SW corner of NE 122nd Street and 172nd Avenue NE

Contact: Andy Paroline *with* Paroline Associates

Staff Contact: Benjamin Sticka, 425-556-2470 or bsticka@redmond.gov

Mr. Sticka said this is the first pre-application meeting for the new school. Primary access to the site will be from 172nd Ave NE with some secondary access off of 122nd Street. This project is located in an R-4 single family, urban residential zone. The school is proposed two stories with 30 classrooms and 4 portables. During review of the project, staff suggested highlighting the blank walls with either student artwork or something to add visual interest. Staff would also suggest strengthening the primary entry way to the street and the neighborhood.

Mr. Andy Cottrill from BLRB architects gave an overview of the new school. A citizen's review committee has formed guidelines for all future schools so this design has been reviewed as it has gone through the design process. The site is currently undeveloped including some trees to be preserved.

The roads around the site are narrow so moving traffic off the street for queuing is one of the goals. Queuing is shown by the dashed lines in the plans. There are 79 parking spaces for teachers and staff. The playfields are off to the side and there is a covered play area with equipment in the back of the school. The plan showed the classroom portables and the cafeteria. The second story up the main building is the library and administration offices. Heating will be supplied by a geo-thermal field.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the materials shown as it looks to be all brick. Mr. Cottrill said the materials are under review currently for costs so there is no final decision. The materials being considered are red brick, grey brick and metal paneling.
- He is encouraged by the slide that shows the modulation of the walls and roof elements compared to the picture on the website.
- Thinks that the ends of buildings are a good addition to the project.
- Feels the layout makes sense.

Mr. Liu:

- Thinks the parking before the drop off area may create some confusion for the school users.
- Feels that overall, it is a good, functional site plan.

Mr. Sutton:

- Stated that the queuing situation is similar to other schools, but appreciates the long area for drops offs and pickups on this site.
- Asked if this building is under built and if the portables are going in right away. Mr. Catterall said he was not sure when the portables would go onsite.

Ms. Karagouni:

- Appreciates the landscape around the school.
- Asked if there a strategy to make the building self-sustaining since it is a public school? Mr. Cottrill said he was not sure that was within the budget, but there is a lot of natural lighting and the geo-thermal field for heat. All the other lighting is LED.
- Wondered if the library has been developed with the natural light. Mr. Cottrill explained that the library is important, but has not been fully developed at this time.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Asked about the park behind the school play yard. Mr. Cottrill was unaware of the park and will look into it further.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2016-00969, Blackbird

Description: Blackbird will be located on 3 parcels in downtown Redmond. The three existing buildings will be demolished, and replaced with a new building, approximately 152 apartment units with an additional 6 live/work lofts.

Location: 7601 159th Place NE

Contact: Brandon Deal *with* Deal Investments

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418 or glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee said this is the first pre-application for the project known as the Blackbird and is located directly across the street from the Carter and the recently approved Heron projects. If the live/work units are still in the new packet, staff would prefer having true commercial versus live/work units.

Mr. Robert Kiker stated this project is a proposed mixed use building with 155 units over a 3 levels of garage with commercial space on the street. It is located on the west side of 159th Place NE. This is very early in the project and the site plan shows it to be land locked as it is bounded on three sides by private property. The only frontage is to the east on 159th. Because the site is land locked, 2 access lanes must be provided for fire and emergency vehicles. In order to honor the 14' sidewalks in front of the building, there is a deviation request to decrease the set back in the rear of the building from 10' to 5'8". This would not cause any impact to the neighbors behind the building would be 40' from the property line.

There is 1 level of proposed underground parking and then a 2 story commercial space with a mezzanine. Then 5 stories of apartments with a roof terrace. Beside the 14' setback the building will be undercut another 10' to make the building seem like it is floating. There is a proposed canopy at about the 10' or 12' level to add a more human scale. The parking garage diagrams were shown. On the SE corner there are 3 proposed live/work units and then on the NE corner there will be a commercial space. The typical unit drawing was shown on the slide with a shared common space on each floor.

The front will be modulated by balconies and decks. On each floor, each corner will have large two bedroom units with one plus bedrooms in the middle. There will be smaller one bedrooms that face the back with open one bedrooms and three studio apartments. On the top floor, the studio apartments have been eliminated and the space is used for the amenity space. Up the spiral staircase from the amenity space will be the roof deck.

The basic concept of the building is just basically a block, which is what urban infill site dictates. There will also be Juliet balconies on the sides of the building. A rendering of the street level view was shown to the Board to show how the building would be engaging with the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked why the U shape of the building is not facing towards the street as opposed to the neighbor to the west? Mr. Kiker said the reason for that is the best units would be facing an alley.
- The amenity space is nice, but really high up in the building.

- Felt that the website showed the plan as wider than it is. Mr. Kiker said the building is not that wide, but the intent is to make this building the jewel box of the neighborhood.
- Liked the balconies and the change in materials.
- Wonders if there is a way to enhance the front of the building with color. Mr. Kiker said that color possibilities are being looked at now.
- Is fine with the setback deviation.

Mr. Liu:

- Feels the setback deviation will work fine.
- Asked what are the buildings to the north and south of this building? Mr. Kiker replied there is not much context yet, but on the north side is a very small building and the south side is parking lots.
- Likes the simplicity this building brings to the neighborhood.

Mr. Sutton:

- Does not have any problems with the setback deviation.
- Feels the project is off to a good start.

Ms. Karagouni:

- Likes the elegant design and enjoys what is been done on the streetscape.
- Thinks the glass glazing on the bottom level makes it look like the jewel box as intended.
- Wonder if there could be some sliding shades added on the sides that would have the façade be different everyday with the residents moving the shades.

Mr. Palmquist:

- Likes the juliet balconies.
- Thinks the deviation seems to work well.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:00 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (5-0).

July 7, 2016
MINUTES APPROVED ON


RECORDING SECRETARY